



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/579,947

05/26/2000

David T. Bagley

17911-14

8199

7590

10/06/2003

Marc E Brown Esq
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP
2029 Century Park East Suite 3800
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/579,947

Applicant(s)

BAGLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37-77,96-108 and 110-112 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36,78-95,109,113 and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 7.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action on the merits of this application. Claims 1-114 have been presented for examination. The claims have been restricted and elected according to the Election/Restriction requirement below. Thus, claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, and 114 have been elected, and claims 37-77, 96-108, and 110-112 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, and 114, drawn to a method and system for allowing a single string to be inputted into one of many applications, classified in class 709, subclass 245.
 - II. Claims 37-46 and 110, drawn to a method and system for validating a string including a telephone number for use in an application, classified in class 379, subclass 90.01.
 - III. Claims 47-52, 111, and 112, drawn to a method and system for resequencing a string, classified in class 715, subclass 540.
 - IV. Claims 53-65, and 96-108, drawn to a method for allowing a DNS to serve one or more sub-level domains, classified in class 709, subclass 249.
 - V. Claims 66-77, drawn to a system and method for receiving a string, converting it to a telephone number, and resequencing the number, classified in class 379, subclass 142.13.

Art Unit: 2153

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the validity check described in the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as validity checks of address strings in a single-application system.

Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the resequencing steps described in the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as resequencing addresses for security purposes on a single-application system.

Inventions I and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP §

Art Unit: 2153

806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require a dedicated domain server for serving sub-level domain levels. The subcombination has separate utility such as selecting appropriate address strings in a single-application system.

Inventions I and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the specific telephone functions described in the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as a telephone set communication system.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each group will be different in subject area and scope, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Rob Blackmon on September 24, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, 114. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 37-77, 96-108, and 110-112 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 2153

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Subject to the following paragraph, a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.

2. Claims 9-12, 17, 35, 36, and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In considering claims 6 and 9, these claims contradicts claim 1, from which they depend, and are thus unclear. Claim 1 requires that the plurality of different applications are of different types: "at least one communication application selected from a collection of different types of applications." However, claims 6 and 9 then state that "said communication applications include communication applications of the same type and/or same type but diverse formats." Thus, the recitation of applications "of

different types” “of the same type” is confusing and contradictory. Correction is required.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9, and are thus rejected as well.

In considering claim 17, the claim is ambiguous and is thus unclear. The claim states, “wherein said communication medium is a homogeneous and/or a plurality of heterogeneous mediums.” If the claim refers to only a single medium – i.e. “said communication medium,” it is unclear as to how it can be a plurality of mediums.

In considering claim 109, the phrase “said re-sequenced string” in the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 23 instead of claim 22 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

In considering claim 35, the phrase “said corresponding valid address format” on lines 2-3 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 31 instead of claim 30 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

In considering claim 36, the phrase “said valid address format” on line 2 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 31 instead of claim 30 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

3. Claims 5, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, fourth paragraph, for failing to further limit the claims from which it depends.

Claim 5 recites, "said communication medium is selected from the group of homogeneous and of heterogeneous mediums," while claim 17 recites, "said communication medium is a homogeneous and/or a plurality of heterogeneous mediums." This does not appear to further limit claim 4, from which claim 5 depends, or claim 16, from which claim 17 depends. The limitation in claims 5 and 17 seems to imply that the communication medium (or a plurality of communication mediums) can be either homogeneous, or heterogeneous (or both, according to the and/or term in claim 17). Any communication medium will necessarily be either homogeneous or heterogeneous. Thus, claims 5 and 17 fail to further limit the claims from which they depend.

Claim 18 contains similar language, and a similar non-limiting concept: "wherein said plurality of diverse communication applications include communication applications having the same or diverse formats." Any group of communication applications will necessarily have either the same or diverse formats. Thus, claim 18 fails to further limit the claim from which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chern (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,005).

In considering claim 1, Chern discloses a the claimed system, including a plurality of input subsystems for receiving an address string that has a valid format for each subsystem (i.e. a browser on a mobile phone, or a different browser on another device both receive a phone number), wherein the same address string can be validly inputted into one of a collection of diverse communication applications (i.e. a phone number can be input into a browser on a phone, or a different browser on an integrated vehicle phone, or another browser on a different device; see col. 4, lines 30-36, 40-41, 50-52).

In considering claim 2, Chern further discloses that the address string is associated with a recipient entity (i.e. the recipient's phone number).

In considering claim 6, as understood, Chern further discloses that the collection of communication applications includes communication applications of the same type (i.e. different browsers-type applications).

In considering claim 28, claim 28 recites a method claim that presents no further limitations over the system described in claim 1. Thus, claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

5. Claims 1-6, 15-20, 22, 25, 28-30, 78-82, 84-88, 92, 94, 95, 113, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yacoby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,311, hereinafter "Yacoby").

In considering claim 1, Yacoby discloses a the claimed system, including a plurality of input subsystems for receiving an address string that has a valid format for each subsystem (i.e. a phone, pda, or pc can be used to enter an address into a dialog box; col. 2, lines 13-18; col. 6, lines 20-25), wherein the same address string can be validly inputted into one of a collection of diverse communication applications (i.e. a phone number can be input into a browser on a phone, or a different browser on a different device, or just a phone application on a telephone; see col. 6, lines 9-25).

In considering claim 2, Yacoby further discloses that the address string is associated with a recipient entity (i.e. the recipient, or "registrant," has both a phone number and a web page; col. 13, lines 4-6).

In considering claim 3, Yacoby further discloses a subsystem for recognizing that the input address has a different format than the format used by the communication application, and a mapping subsystem for converting the format into one utilized by the communication application (i.e. the phone number, which cannot be used with its dashes and parentheses, is converted into a "unformatted telephone number" so it can be used by the browser application to access a destination; col. 6, lines 2-15).

In considering claim 4, Yacoby further discloses a selector subsystem to determine at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and a communication subsystem to establish communication based on the address string across the determined communication medium (i.e. the system determines that an Internet connection is to be made when the user enters the domain name, and thereby communicates via the Internet; col. 10, lines 40-56).

In considering claim 5, Yacoby further discloses that the communication medium is selected from homogeneous and of heterogeneous mediums (this will necessarily be so – see 112 4th paragraph rejection above).

In considering claim 6, as understood, Yacoby further discloses that some communication applications in the system can be communication applications of the same type (i.e. different browser-type applications).

In considering claim 15, Yacoby discloses a method for communicating across at least two communication media, the method comprising:

Receiving an address string comprising at least a telephone number of a target entity and terminating in a top level internet domain (col. 10, line 42, “2137086950.bytel.org”), and inputting the address string into at least one communication application selected from a plurality of diverse applications wherein the

Art Unit: 2153

same address string can be validly inputted for any selected communication application (col. 7, lines 60-67; col. 10, lines 40-45, wherein the address string can be validly inputted into a browser to connect to the registrant's web site, or the address string can be validly entered using telephone keys and associated software on a telephone (inherent in the Yacoby system, since it includes valid telephone numbers) to call the registrant via phone).

In considering claim 16, Yacoby further discloses determining at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and establishing communication across the determined communication medium (i.e. the user determines the medium by selecting a phone or an Internet browser).

In considering claim 17, as understood, Yacoby further discloses that the medium is homogeneous and/or heterogeneous (this will necessarily be so – see 112 4th paragraph rejection above).

In considering claim 18, as understood, Yacoby further discloses that the plurality of diverse communication applications include communication applications having the same or diverse formats (this will be necessarily so – see 112 4th paragraph rejection above).

In considering claim 19, Yacoby further discloses that the application is a world wide web resource locator (i.e. browser).

In considering claim 20, Yacoby further discloses that the application is a telephone service (inherent, since the system includes telephones for making calls using the registrant phone numbers).

In considering claim 22, recognizing that the input address has a different format than the format used by the communication application, and mapping the string into a format utilized by the communication application (i.e. the phone number, which cannot be used with its dashes and parentheses, is converted into a "unformatted telephone number" so it can be used by the browser application to access a destination; col. 6, lines 2-15).

In considering claim 25, Yacoby further discloses that the address string consists of a registered domain name (i.e. "2137086950.bytel.org,").

In considering claim 28, claim 28 recites a method claim that presents no further limitations over the system described in claim 1. Thus, claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

In considering claim 29, Yacoby further discloses determining at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and establishing communication across the determined communication medium (i.e. the user determines the medium by selecting a phone or an Internet browser).

In considering claim 30, claim 30 recites a method claim that is parallel to the system limitations claimed in claim 3. Thus, claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

In considering claim 78, Yacoby discloses a method of connecting a user's communication applications across at least two diverse communication media (i.e. phone and Internet) to a recipient's respective communication applications using a common address string (i.e. phone number), comprising:

Forming the common address string by combining the recipient's telephone number with a top level domain name (col. 10, line 42, "2137086950.bytel.org");

Inputting at least a portion of the common address string into at least two of the user's communication applications (i.e. either a browser or a phone, col. 6, lines 20-25, wherein entering a number into the phone is inherent in the system taught by Yacoby);

Using the inputted portion to connect to the recipient's respective communication applications (col. 13, lines 3-6, 25-27);

Wherein the communication media are chosen from telephone systems, world wide web resource locators, and internet browsers (col. 7, lines 60-67; col. 13, lines 25-27).

In considering claim 79, Yacoby further discloses that the common address string forms a valid Internet domain name or sub-domain name ("2137086950.bytel.org" or "bytel.org").

In considering claim 80, Yacoby further discloses differentiating between valid and invalid components of the inputted common address string, stripping predetermined non-alphanumeric, invalid components to form a stripped input string, and selectively mapping the invalid components to a corresponding number grouped in the format as represented by buttons of a telephone key pad to form a registered internet address (col. 6, lines 9-25; col. 10, lines 1-27, 33-56, wherein the non-numeric portions of the phone number are mapped to an "unformatted telephone number" to create the registered internet address "2137086950.bytel.org");

Wherein the registered Internet address is used by one of the two communication applications to connect with a respective communication application of the recipient (col. 13, lines 3-6, 25-30).

In considering claim 81, Yacoby further discloses that the form of the registered Internet address is "telno.domain" (i.e. "2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 82, Yacoby further discloses that the subsystem is incorporated into an Internet domain name system denominated by the top level domain of the common address string (col. 6, lines 9-25; col. 10, lines 37-56, wherein a parsing server associated with bytel.com parses the address string, which includes the reformatting the telephone number).

In considering claim 84, Yacoby further discloses that the form of the registered Internet address is "telno.x.domain" (i.e. "2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 85, Yacoby further discloses that the common address string also includes a dot-delimited subdomain (i.e. "2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 86, Yacoby further discloses that the dot-delimited subdomain determines the communication medium (i.e. the "bytel.org" subdomain determines that the medium is the Internet).

In considering claims 87 and 88, Yacoby further discloses that the second communication application is a www resource locator or a telephone service.

In considering claim 92, Yacoby further discloses that the address is a registered domain name ("2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 94, Yacoby further discloses that the address string is a validly registered domain name ("2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 95, Yacoby further discloses that the common address string is a registered internet domain name ("2137086950.bytel.org").

In considering claim 113, Yacoby further discloses that the valid internet domain name is a top level domain (".org").

In considering claim 114, Yacoby further discloses that the registered internet domain name is a top level domain (".org").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoby.

In considering claim 83, although the system taught by Yacoby discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the subsystem for parsing the telephone number is incorporated in the client system. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that parsing strings at a client device in order to render a valid string (i.e. spellcheck, computer program code error-checking) is well known. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the parsing system taught by Yacoby on the client system, instead of the server system,

to avoid unnecessary network bandwidth usage and to free up processing capabilities at the server.

7. Claims 21, 35-36, and 89-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoby, in view of Agraharam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,231, hereinafter "Agraharam").

In considering claims 21, 35-36, and 89-91, claims 21 and 89 require that the application is an e-mail application, claim 35 requires that the address is converted into a valid e-mail address, and claims 36 and 90-91 require that the address is converted into a valid e-mail address using the "@" symbol and at least one character. Yacoby does not discuss the use of e-mail in the address conversion system. Instead, Yacoby discloses that the telephone number is converted into an address for use in Internet WWW connections. Nonetheless, in terms of communications, the use of e-mail is quite similar to Internet WWW connections. Both include inputting an address into an input area and using that address to access a recipient's system. In the case of Internet WWW connections, the address is a URL. In the case of an e-mail system, the address is an e-mail address (typically using the "@" symbol). Thus, given the knowledge in the art of such similarities, it would not be surprising to find that telephone numbers are commonly used to convert to valid e-mail addresses for sending e-mail messages. Such a conversion system is in fact well known in the art, as evidenced by Agraharam. In a similar art, Agraharam teaches a system for converting entered phone numbers into e-mail addresses, so that users can send messages to e-mail recipients merely by

Art Unit: 2153

entering a phone number (col. 2, line 43 – col. 3, line 13). Agraharam actually teaches a domain name system that converts a voice message received from a telephone to an e-mail by converting the recipient's phone number into the recipient's e-mail address. This demonstrates that converting entered phone numbers into e-mail addresses is well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the telephone-number-to-e-mail conversion taught by Agraharam in the system taught by Yacoby, so that users could just as easily call or visit a recipient's web page as they could send the recipient an e-mail.

8. Claims 7-11, 23, 24, 31, 32, 34, 93, and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoby, in view of Low (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,281).

In considering claim 7, although the system taught by Yacoby discloses reformatting each telephone number (i.e. translating each component of the number into a predetermined number) and then transforming an entered phone number into a valid domain name, it fails disclose that those features are implemented by performing segmenting the components, re-sequencing the segmented components, and then resolving that number into a valid address format. Nonetheless, the steps of segmenting, re-sequencing, and resolving a phone number into a valid address format are well known, as evidenced by Low. In a similar art, Low discloses a system for reformatting inputted telephone numbers to create valid URLs, wherein the reformatting includes segmenting and re-sequencing the components, and resolving the resultant number into a valid address (col. 18, lines 29-41; col. 19, lines 48-65). Thus, given the

Art Unit: 2153

teaching of Low, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using the reformatting system taught by Low to reformat the inputted telephone numbers in the system taught by Yacoby, to reflect the fact that the DNS labels are arranged least significant number to first (see Low, col. 19, lines 60-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to perform the formatting steps taught by Low in the domain name translation system taught by Yacoby.

In considering claim 8, Yacoby further discloses that the valid address is used to establish communication with a WWW location (col. 4, line 60-62).

In considering claim 9, as understood, Yacoby further discloses that some communication applications in the system can be communication applications of the same type (i.e. different browser-type applications).

In considering claim 10, Yacoby further discloses that the application is a world wide web resource locator (i.e. browser).

In considering claim 11, Yacoby further discloses that the application is a telephone service (inherent, since the system includes telephones for making calls using the registrant phone numbers).

Claim 23 presents the same translation, segmentation, and re-sequencing steps as claim 7, and is thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claim 24, Yacoby further discloses that the valid address format is an Internet website address format (col. 4, lines 60-62).

Claim 31 presents the same translation, segmentation, re-sequencing, and resolving steps as claim 7, and is thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claim 32, Yacoby further discloses that the valid address format is an Internet website address format (col. 4, lines 60-62).

In considering claim 34, Yacoby further discloses that the address string is associated with at least one recipient entity (registrant's web page, col. 4, lines 60-62).

Claims 93 and 109 present the same resolving step as claim 7, and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

9. Claims 12-14, 26-27, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoby, in view of Low, and further in view of Agraharam.

In considering claims 12-14, 26-27, and 33, claim 12 requires that the application is an e-mail application, and claims 13, 26, and 33 require that the address is converted

Art Unit: 2153

into a valid e-mail address, and claims 14 and 27 require that the address is converted into a valid e-mail address using the "@" symbol and at least one character. Yacoby does not discuss the use of e-mail in the address conversion system. Instead, Yacoby discloses that the telephone number is converted into an address for use in Internet WWW connections. Nonetheless, in terms of communications, the use of e-mail is quite similar to Internet WWW connections. Both include inputting an address into an input area and using that address to access a recipient's system. In the case of Internet WWW connections, the address is a URL. In the case of an e-mail system, the address is an e-mail address (typically using the "@" symbol). Thus, given the knowledge in the art of such similarities, it would not be surprising to find that telephone numbers are commonly used to convert to valid e-mail addresses for sending e-mail messages. Such a conversion system is in fact well known in the art, as evidenced by Agraharam. In a similar art, Agraharam teaches a system for converting entered phone numbers into e-mail addresses, so that users can send messages to e-mail recipients merely by entering a phone number (col. 2, line 43 – col. 3, line 13). Agraharam actually teaches a domain name system that converts a voice message received from a telephone to an e-mail by converting the recipient's phone number into the recipient's e-mail address. This demonstrates that converting entered phone numbers into e-mail addresses is well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the telephone-number-to-e-mail conversion taught by Agraharam in the system taught by Yacoby and Low, so that users could just as easily call or visit a recipient's web page as they could send the recipient an e-mail.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all correspondences: (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

BE
September 29, 2003


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100